11: Watanabe E-4,5 (1951-1959) 1964 AB6 Ainu AB6

group whether obtained by adoption or by birth. In either of the Otopuke and Satnai valleys all the local groups formed a single *shine itokpa* group. But the local groups who lived in the Tokapchi valley were divided into several *shine itokpa* groups: the one in the upstream area consisted of seven local groups of Kuttarashi, Nitmap, Pipaushi, Kumaushi, Sanenkoro, Moseushi and Penke Pipaushi, another group on the middle course consisted possibly of five local groups of Kene, Memroputu, Pipairu, Fushiko and Shupusara, and perhaps one or two more *shine itokpa* groups further downstream which could not be identified.

The group had neither single authority nor common territory. The only collective action of the *shine itokpa* group, so far as identified by the present writer, was the bear ceremony (pp. 74-77). It provided the only occasion for meeting many of their relatives and friends who resided outside the local group. In normal times no group larger than the local group took part in any collective enterprise, though on rare occasions two related families from different local groups within a *shine itokpa* group might and actually did privately join to cooperate in hunting or fishing. Formal relations between local groups were rarely established, but through intermarriage (p. 17) there might have been many individual contacts between kin and affines in different local groups.

The River Group.

The river group is an aggregation of all the local groups which lived along a river as distinguished by the Ainu[18]. It was called by the name of the river plus *un utaru*, the people in such and such a river. The river group might consist of a single *shine itokpa* group as in each of the Otopuke and Satnai valleys or consist of several *shine itokpa* groups as in the Tokapchi valley. They regarded the river basin as their own territory, claiming exclusive rights to exploit all its resources, which they defended against the trespass of outsiders (pp. 56-57; 67-68; 77-78). Hence they were also called *shine iworo ukokoru utaru*, the people jointly possessing one and the same *iworu* of the river valley as distinguished by the Ainu. However, at least in normal times, there was no single authority controlling the group as a whole. The main bond which linked the people of a river together not only seems to have been economic interests but a deeply rooted cosmological background. There is evidence that each river as distinguished by the Ainu was associated with one or several particular *ekashi itokpa*. It was the *shine itokpa* group which had one of these aboriginal *itokpa*. Only the people having the aboriginal *itokpa* associated with the river, observing the associated ritual for local deities and living in the river valley, were regarded as the real people of the river who were entitled to be guardians of the river valley and of the deities that were believed to live there and look after them (pp. 70-71; 77-78).

11: Watanabe E-4,5 (1951-1959) 1964 AB6 Ainu AB6

● 69 that were believed to live there and look after them (pp. 70-71; 77-78). The river group appears to have observed collective rituals against catastrophic natural phenomena but any collective actions in normal times by the group as a whole could not be identified by the present writer.

Marriage and Intermarriage.

582 611 The most notable of the Ainu habits concerning marriage might be the avoidance of coupling of the matrilineally related. Women of common descent through female line from an ancestress were called *shine huchi ikiru*, one and the same ancestress descent, who regarded themselves as female relatives, *menoko iriwaki*, to one another. The *huchi ikiru* kinship, however, could not usually be traced at most beyond a depth of three or four generations[19]. The implication of the advoidance is that men should not marry women of the same *huchi ikiru* as their mothers[20].

611 It might be said that women related by *huchi ikiru* kinship constituted a kin group; however, the present writer has found no reason to regard them as a corporate kin group. They had no single authority. They did not hold any common property and never came together to carry out any collective enterprise organized on the level of a *huchi ikiru* group as a whole.

611 602 It is true that women who assisted a woman in marriage, childbirth, illness and death, were her *huchi ikiru* relatives[21]. These activities of mutual help seems to have been based on the person-to-person relation of *huchi ikiru* kinship.

582 591 To what extent intermarriage was practised is only partly known[22]. The present writer was able to identify premarrital and postmarrital residences of the married persons who lived in six of seven local groups which formed a *shine itokpa* group on the upper Tokapchi at ca. 1880-85 (Table 2; Genealogical Charts 1-6), and obtained the following result.

1) Marriage between the members of the same local group 15
2) Wife married to live with her husband in the local group where he was born:
   A) From one of the member local groups of the *shine itokpa* group of her husband 12
   B) From outside the *shine itokpa* group of her husband:
      a) From one of the member local groups of the same river group as her husband's 3
         (2 from Perutnai, 1 from Memroputu)
3) Husband married to live with his wife in the local group where his wife was born:
   A) From one of the member local groups of the *shine itokpa* group of his wife 3

11: Watanabe E-4,5 (1951-1959) 1964 AB6 Ainu AB6

[Q.56]

V

TERRITORIES AND GATHERING AREAS

A territory here is defined simply as an area defended and protected by members of a group against intruding members of other groups. Though various types of territories were held by the Ainu, all were concerned with the exploitation of natural resources found thereon. Ainu territorialism was a part of the spatial structure of their community which had a direct relevance to their adaptation to habitat. The maintenance of a territory could be an important factor in relation to the distribution and spacing of groups and to group activities (cf. BARTHROMIW and BIRDSELL, 1953).

423 [182]

Territories as held by the Ainu fall into two categories: one, the territory inhabited and utilized exclusively by a river group as a whole (p. 16), and the other, inner-territories stewarded as gathering sites by individual groups within the river group, i.e. local groups, cooperative groups and simple families.

The Territory Held by the River Group.

The territory occupied by each river group formed itself on the basis of a *pet* or a river as prescribed by the Ainu themselves and its surrounding area (p. 16). So far as the territories surveyed by the present writer are concerned, this covered an area bounded in partly by mountain ridges forming watersheds for the adjoining rivers, *pet*, and partly by tributaries of the river or adjoining rivers, as seen in the case of Otopuke, Tokapchi, Tushipet, Azuma and Saru[48]. As regards the Shikot the actual line of demarcation is unknown except for that interior part which was bounded in by the crest lines forming the watersheds for the adjoining rivers. As far as the present writer has examined, the actual lines of demarcation of most of these territories, as shown on Map 2, present some difficulty in identification, especially in the lower regions, although it seems doubtful whether such ambiguity had actually existed or the memory has been lost to available informants.

423 619

Attention must be directed to the fact that a river group and its territory were not necessarily based on a geographically defined river system as a unit. Sometimes a single river group and its territory evolved around a river system, as with the Azuma; sometimes more than one river group and their territories developed around a single river system, as with the Tokapchi, each evolving around the main stream or one of the larger tributaries.

11: Watanabe E-4,5 (1951-1959) 1964 AB6 Ainu AB6

619
423

Geographically Defined River System	Component River around which a River Group Evolved	Number of River Groups & Their Territories
Azuma River	Azuma	1
Mukawa River	Mukawa	1
Ishikari River	Ishikari Shikot Others unidentified	2 (or more ?)
Saru River	Saru ?Nukapira[48]	1 (or 2?)
Tokapchi River	Tokapchi Tushipet Ashoro Otopuke Satnai	5

311
619
423

Each territory utilized exclusively by the residing river group can be divided according to Ainu's exploitation activity into the following five ecological zones (Fig. 8):

(1) the river and its tributaries,
(2) the river banks,
(3) the river terraces,
(4) the stretch of hillsides along the river course,
(5) the high mountain region around the source of the river.

In order to supply themselves with a set of biotic species needed for subsistence, the Ainu exploited these different areas in accordance with particular ecologies of species and particular techniques for their exploitation. In this manner the territory occupied by a river group formed a nearly or completely self-sufficient unit of Ainu habitat. Sometimes, a failing supply of a needed item within its own area or a finding of better sites without, induced some members of a river group to pass across its boundary. Two of such essential items were the bear and the aconite plant for preparing arrow poison. Except for these, all river groups were self-sufficing in necessary items (p. 85). In short, the Ainu had seldom to overstep their boundaries for gathering purposes. As regards the staple items in particular, such as deer, dog salmon, cherry salmon and edible plants, every river group was at ordinary times sufficiently supplied from resources found within its own territory.

619
423

When for gathering purposes any one was to step into a river group territory other than his own, no matter for what, where and how, the person was required to obtain from some one of the headmen of the river valley concerned a formal permission accompanied with a rigid ritual procedure. And there was possibility of such permit not granted by a headman who had

[TEXT CONTINUED ON PAGE 59]

11: Watanabe E-4,5 (1951-1959) 1964 AB6 Ainu AB6

619 423 the sole power to act in the matter. On getting permission, the person was made acceptable to all other local groups within the territory through communication and introduction by the issuing headman (p. 77).

423 621 Territories Maintained by Groups Smaller than the River Group within the Territory of the River Group[47].

The following territories were maintained by individual simple families, cooperative groups and local groups forming the larger group, i. e. the river group: places for setting bows and deer-fences, named concentrations of spawning beds of dog salmon, sites for peep-fishing huts, fish-traps and weirs.

Evidence from Saru suggests that a site for digging aconite in the lower Saru was under control of a local group nearest to it (WATANABE, 1951, pp. 78–79). It is true that collecting sites for the plant of 'best' quality were localized (p. 66). The territoriality on the sites in other areas is unknown. It seems to be certain that bears' dens were owned by Ainu hunters but the category of the controlling body can not be identified clearly.

Types of Territory

Territory Maintained by the River Group as a Whole	Territories Maintained by Smaller Groups within the River Group	Controlling Body	Condition of the Place
River basin as prescribed by the Ainu	Site for peep-hut (*worun chise karu ushi*)	Individual simple family	Unstable
	Site for fish-trap (*urai karu ushi*)		
	Site for weir (*tesh karu ushi*)	Cooperative group	Stable
	Place for setting bows (*ku ari ushi*)		
	Place for deer-fence (*kuteki ushi*)		
	Named concentration of spawning beds of dog salmon (*yaicharo iki, ichan* or *ichanuni*)	Local group	Very stable

The ichthyological characters of the spawning beds and grounds of dog salmon have already been described (Note 28). It was customary with each Ainu local group to give a name to the respective spawning grounds near their settlement where spawning beds of the salmon recurred every season in a greater concentration than elsewhere and to observe anually a series of rituals for these as the controlling body of the particular fishing grounds (p. 72). Each settlement was usually situated near one of the spawning grounds

11: Watanabe E-4,5 (1951-1959) 1964 AB6 Ainu AB6

621 423 311 [103]

Named Spawning Grounds on the Satnai, a Tributary to the Tokapchi[10]
(in descending order of location)

Name of Spawning Ground	Approximate Length (yd.)	Group Exploiting Regularly	Controlling Body
Nupokomap Un Ichan	200	Nupokomap settlement group	Nupokomap group as local group
Riyoromap Un Ichan	?	〃	〃
Urekarip Un Ichan	600	Urekarip settlement group	Urekarip group as local group

The analysis of the spawning grounds on the Azuma is incomplete owing to the death of Ushintasan, the chief informant from the area. There are some data on the spawning grounds on the Saru; however, the time horizon concerned is shortly after the land allotment[11]. [115]

The nature of the hunting grounds was previously explained in relation to their hunting devices (p. 31; Notes 33 and 37). Distribution of the hunting grounds of the cooperative groups from Nitmap and Pipaushi is shown in the charts in pp. 45–46 and in Map 2.

The area of the territories maintained by a given group never extended beyond the capacity of the group for direct and efficient exploitation of them. Nor were any new grounds sought elsewhere until those hitherto utilized had fallen unproductive. If a group moved to a new locality leaving its ground in disuse, it ceased to have claim on the old territory. The number of fish-trapping sites varied to a considerable extent with different familes. This means that more traps were used by families with less catches by spearing against the total amount of supply needed. How these holdings by individual simple families and cooperative groups were inherited remains to be explored.

Each territory held by simple family, cooperative group or local group served as a ground for supplying specific resources, but it was only for a period of time peculiar to the ecology of each game to be obtained. For example, the bear-hunting ground was good only in spring and autumn and the dog-salmon spawning-grounds in autumn only. As a result, territorialism held by the Ainu for their localities waxed strong in season and nearly or entirely vanished out of season. On the other hand, inter-river-group-territorialism—territorialism which a river group displayed for its own river valley—induced them to refuse a stranger or outsider to exploit any kind of its resources without permission, whether in season or out of season. 423 221 311 [619]

Except spawning grounds of dog salmon and colonies of aconites, these territories controlled by the smaller groups within the river group are found in every instance to be fishing or hunting grounds furnished with fixed instruments. Unless conditions for exploiting specific resources did not fall off, 423

11: Watanabe E-4,5 (1951-1959) 1964 AB6 Ainu AB6

423 the same group enjoyed a successive use of the same site within which no outsider could bring in specific instruments or exploit specific resources. 423 They were to 'refrain' from such acts. Spawning grounds of the dog salmon 619 were not available even to fellow river-group-members except on permission [628] formally obtained from the headman of the controlling local group. Such permission could be had whenever asked by anyone in the same river group (p. 77).

Except for such specified localities, the entire area within the river group territory might be utilized freely by any member belonging to the group. In this open area any person, male or female, could freely open up a new ground for set-bow hunting or trap-fishing, go hunting with hand-bow, or go about collecting plants. It appears that even the aforesaid specific localities were open to anyone in the same river group when it was not season assigned for a particular locality.

[311] Despite the presence of the aforesaid free-gathering areas within the river group territory, the Ainu usually were able to obtain most of their necessary supplies from the immediate surroundings of each settlement without having to go out great distances for the gathering (Maps 2).

2226 Areas Actually Covered by Ainu Gatherers (Map 2).

311 Fishing Areas.

628 Generally, the dog salmon was taken for the most part in and around the spawning grounds found near the settlement. Favourable sites for the use of fixed fishing gear and hidings of the salmon suited for daytime spearing, were all found centred around the concentrations of the spawning beds or spawning grounds which best fitted night spearing (Figs. 3 and 4). Some fishermen from each settlement went farther down their stream in early season; as the season advanced they turned upstream and then went down again in late season, for the farther downstream, the earlier the arrival of the salmon and the longer its stay and the farther upstream, the earlier the spawning (Note 26). Thus some of Otopuke and Azuma fishermen went into the area of the next settlement or even farther within the territory of their river group; but the fishermen on the upper Tokapchi seldom went to the area close on an adjacent settlement. The people of Opchapet and Ichanpet settlements in Otopuke, who had relatively few and sporadic spawning beds near their settlements, went to the spawning grounds regularly exploited by the neighbouring Kamaune settlement belonging to their local group and by permission went farther down to the spawning ground of the Nipushipet settlement which belonged to another local group. By the same reason the people of Azuma, a settlement and a local group belonging to the Azuma river group, went fishing dog-salmon up in the water area near the adjacent

11: Watanabe E-4,5 (1951-1959) 1964 AB6 Ainu AB6

619 Actions for the Maintainance of the River Group Territory.

628 All Ainu territories were defended and protected for the natural resources
423 found therein. Protection of a river group territory and guarding it from trespasses, as will be seen later, comprised the following practice: reporting by any one of his or her passing or coming to a gathering site to the nearest settlement; keeping watch by each local group member over any outsider, questioning him or her about suspicious conduct and reporting it to the headman; and checking by the headman of all information brought in by his group members and keeping contact by him with other headmen in the same river area. The scheme thus functioned with cooperation of the local group members and a cooperation between headmen in the same valley. It must be noted, however, that these actions for defending the river group territory against trespasses were no specialized occupation of specific personnel but were merely side work performed by each Ainu while engaging in regular manual work. As a result, the extent of effective vigilance seems to have been confined to the area covered habitually in daily routine. It may be assumed therefore that in large but sparsely populated river valleys like the Tokapchi, especially in the mountainous regions, scattered areas occured which were seldom or rarely visited by any Ainu at ordinary times, areas belonging to a river group but left unwatched and unprotected against trespassing.

619 The activities of a river group in defence of their river basin were inte-
224 grated into the following customs. Every Ainu, before going on a hunt, ob-
628 served a joint ritual with fellow hunters at the headman's, to whom he made
423 known his general plans and his intended sites for setting spring bows in particular, making at the same time necessary arrangements with other hunters. If the man was going for hand-bow hunting into a mountain on his river course unfamiliar to him or not habitually covered by his fellow members, the custom was for him to call on the headman whose people knew the area well, obtained information about it and the distribution of spring-bow sites in particular, and made his plans known to him. It was also the custom for any one, when hunting in an area in the same valley covered by members of another local group, to make a salutary report to some one of the group concerned, if not to the headman. It was done by way of report or notice rather than for asking formal permission from the headman. If the hunter wished to set spring bows, he should never fail to give detailed information to the headman and get his full understanding beforehand. As regards fish-
619 ing in the open area within his river group territory, it was customary for
628 every fisherman going to a site habitually covered or exploited by another
423 group to report to the settlement of that group either on his way there or
[226] back. Otherwise, it might cause the people of the settlement to be 'troubled

11: Watanabe E-4,5 (1951-1959) 1964 AB6 Ainu AB6

and even alarmed that some stranger, that is, some member of another river group, was venturing trespass'. These procedures, instead of being formulae for asking permission, were to all appearances necessary precautions against possible intrusion from outsiders, i.e. members of other river groups. The headman was kept well informed of every development by his group members and was also in mutual contact with the headmen of neighbouring local groups of his valley. In this manner he was enabled to keep checking who were fishing or hunting in the area habitually covered by his members, where and by whom poison-arrows were being set, and whether or not rituals requisite for exploiting the given resources were conducted properly.

As has been described in this chapter, Ainu territorial actions are part of their community activities indubitably correlated with and conditioned by certain physical factors in their habitat, while they are also a result of community reactions to habitat as viewed by the Ainu themselves, i.e. the subjective or non-physical aspect of habitat, as may be seen in the next chapter.

11: Watanabe E-4,5 (1951-1959) 1964 AB6 Ainu AB6

River System as Seen by the Ainu. 823

The Ainu classified the component parts of a river system into parent and children. In this way, for instance, the Tokapchi river system was classified into the following categories. The main river was regarded as male parent, *zaza*, a tributary as the parent river's male child, *okkai poho*, another as a female child, *matne poho*, and another as child whose sex is unknown to my informants. To the geographer the whole river system is known as the Tokapchi, but the Ainu use this term to refer only to the main river or what the Ainu regard as the parent. The son of the Tokapchi, a tributary, is known as Otopuke, the daughter as Satnai, and the child whose sex is unknown as Tushipet[54]. They have no term to refer to the river system as a whole, the component streams of a river system being each regarded as a separate unit.

They classify individual streams into *pet* and *nai*. So far as the areas investigated by the present writer are concerned, *pet* is larger than *nai*: the former may be called a river and the latter a glen. Any definite criteria of the two categories, however, are not known to the present writer. Each named stream, whether *pet* or *nai*, is the dwelling of, and is owned by, a *kamui*-spirit. The *kamui* was known by the name of the river or the glen which it possessed. For example, the river known as the Otopuke was inhabited by '*Otopuke un pet-orun kamui*' which mean the river-*kamui* living in the Otopuke river. Another name used for the *kamui* is '*Otopuke un pet iworu koru (or amba) kamui*'. *Iworu* means the activity field of *kamui*-spirits, and *koru* or *amba* means 'to own'. The glen-owning *kamui* was called by the name of the glen as, for instance, '*Naitai un nai koru kamui*'. The river-owning-spirit was believed to be the chief or head of the water spirits, *nai koru kamui*, which lived in streams flowing into the river[55]. 823 776

Each river group evolved around a river, *pet*, was distinguished by the name of the river as, for example, '*Otopuke un utaru*', the people of Otopuke. The river basin, i.e. the area drained by the river and its tributary streams, includes fields, hills and mountains. River basins were named by adding the suffix '*iworu*' to the name of the river; for instance, the river basin of Otopuke would be called '*Otopuke iworu*'. In this context *iworu* refers to land. The *iworu*, i.e. the river basin, was claimed by the river group as their territory. It was called, for instance, '*Otopuke un utaru koru iworu*', the *iworu* which the people of Otopuke own. The relation between the river system and the territory of the river group has already been explained in details in Chapter V and Note 45. 823 619

Each river group believed that the land-*iworu* of their own river was also inhabited by a number of various *kamui* or nature-spirits and the chiefs among them as well as the chief water-spirit, resided in the upper reaches of the 823 776

11: Watanabe E-4,5 (1951-1959) 1964 AB6 Ainu AB6

231 own ceremonies, only took part in those of the other sections of the *shine*
796 *itokpa* group[68].

796 Territoriality and the System of Social Solidarity between the Ainu and
619 Habitat.

423 The Ainu used to believe that the *kamui*-spirits which lived in the *iworu* of the neighbouring river looked after them. The inhabitants of a river, i.e. the river group, claimed exclusive rights to exploit the resources in the river basin which consisted of land- and river-*iworu*. Outsiders were allowed no [796] access to those resources except by permission. The permission was obtainable from the headman of any local group in the river valley by going through a certain ritual procedure for the local *kamui*-spirits. Their claim to resources on land was activated not only by their economic interest but also by their cosmological system as such.

423 226 If some one wanted to fish at the spawning grounds owned by another [628] local group, he had to ask for permission of the headman of that group. [782] Under the direction of the headman, the applicant observed a proper ritual for the fire-spirit and the river-owning spirit and offered *inau*-sticks made [431] by him to the spawning ground where he wanted to fish. After fishing, he would give part of his catches to the headman and the people who lived near the spawning ground and customarily fished there. The proportion of the amonunt of the 'gift to the fire-spirit' to his catches seems not to have been prescribed. Among the member local groups of the same river group, permission was usually given without fail.

Fishing in areas of a river outside of those named spawning grounds and private sites was freely done as occasion demanded by the people of the same river, that is, by the members of the river group. There was, however, a custom that in order to prevent any fishing by outsiders without permission, every fisherman gave information of his coming to the people of the nearby [431] settlement. Sometimes he might inform on his way home. Also in this case, part of his catches was usually given to them as a gift to the fire-spirit.

776 In the case of gathering, either fishing, hunting or collecting, in the ter-
619 ritory of a different river group, one had to get permission from any one of
423 the headmen in the river valley, regardless of the method of one's fishing or [782] hunting. Such permission was given on the performance of a ritual for local *kamui*-spirits concerned, but not always, because assurance was required that [685] the fisherman or hunter be faithful to the local *kamui*-spirits. The discoverer [785] of any tresspasser must bring him to his headman or some headman available at hand in the river valley, to make him apologize as soon as possible to the local *kamui*-spirits of the river concerned[69]. Also the discovery of such evidence of tresspass as salmon bones thrown in the mountains of the river was

11: Watanabe E-4,5 (1951-1959) 1964 AB6 Ainu AB6

a cause for serious issue, for it meant a grave violation to the *kamui*-spirits of the river from which the people of the river or the river group received exclusive favour and which they guarded with greatest caution. The Ainu expressed the maintaining of their territory, that is, the territory of the river group, by the words 'the guard of our *iworu* owning *kamui*-spirits'. Their territoriality was actually activated not only by economic interest but by their system of social solidarity with nature as such.

The Ainu world was full of divine visitors: all the natural resources exploited by them were *kamui*-spirits in temporary guises. In consequence all their gathering activities implied social intercourse with *kamui*. Moreover, each *kamui* had its own function in relation to the economic and social activities of the Ainu. Thus there was a close interdependence between Ainu and *kamui*, and their rituals and taboos were an expression of this relationship. The relationship, that is, the social solidarity between Ainu and *kamui* was established on the principle of coresidence or local contiguity[70]. Ainu cosmology emphasized its component of spatial orientation; nature, i. e. *kamui*, were ordered on local basis. The effective ritual relationship between those spatially oriented *kamui* and the Ainu was in the hands of the patrilineal kin group of males which formed the basis of the Ainu local organization.

VII

SUMMARIES AND CONCLUSION

105 1. The Ainu territorial grouping is as follows:

[592] Household: Usually consisting of a simple family living in a permanent house.

105 Settlement: Usually consisting of 1-10 households.

621 Located near a named spawning ground of dog salmon, being a unit group

[361] exploiting a spawning ground or grounds in common. Periodical change in population size and sex composition: men migrate to mountain-huts in hunting seasons.

Type 1: Consisting of 3 households or less, forming a single unit in any kind of cooperative work in gathering. Male household-heads not always unilineally related.

Type 2: Consisting of more than 3 households, splitting into more than one unit in any kind of cooperative work in gathering. Male heads of the households constituting each cooperative group not always unilineally related.

Local group: Usually consisting of 5-10 households, the minimum size being 3.

Type A: Single-settlement local group.

a. With settlement type 1, a single cooperative unit in gathering.

b. With settlement type 2, not so.

Type B: Multi-settlement local group.

Mostly with settlement type 1. Local group with only settlement type 2 never encountered.

Common type being A. The principal corporate group characterized by a common headman, collective ownership of spawning grounds of dog salmon, cooperation in house-building, and a collective ritual, i.e. the dog salmon ceremony. The core consisting of a patrilineal descent group: male household-heads patrilineally related, sometimes including a few males semi-adopted through marriage.

105 *Shine itokpa* group. Usually consisting of several adjacent local groups next

614 to each other; the cores forming sections of the patrilineal kin group of males possessing a common male ancestor mark and associated cult. Collective activities in the bear ceremeny but without any chief or common property of the group as a whole.

105 River group. Aggregation of all the local groups inhabiting a river valley

619 as distinguished by the Ainu, consisting of one to three or a few more

[186] at most *shine itokpa* groups. Presence of strong group-consciousness backed by cosmology.

11: Watanabe E-4,5 (1951-1959) 1964 AB6 Ainu AB6

backed by cosmology. Claim to the river valley as their territory; the members free to exploit without permission any resources in the valley except subterritories (hunting and fishing sites) maintained by various groups of lower order. The members potential colaborees in case of defence of their territory and a single unit in case of collective ritual against a catastrophic natural phenomenon. 105 619

2. The Ainu exploited their habitat by means of a set of techniques. Each of their gathering techniques, operated by an individual or in cooperation, was applied to each of specific resources in specific places at specific times; gathering techniques were linked in an order in terms of their spatial and temporal arrangement. Through the arrangement of technical devices and activities the Ainu ecological system was structured spatially and temporally. The spatio-temporal structure was closely connected with the cyclical changes in the habits of the biotic species exploited by them. 105 182

3. The periodical changes of those biotic species to which their ecological system was closely related took place approximately synchronically in different places. Accordingly the Ainu, omnivorously dependent upon various food supplies of such a character, had to exploit resources in different places at the same time. They solved this problem by means of intrafamily division of labour and intrafamily and interfamily cooperation as well as by some automatic devices. 105 476 [592]

4. Any of their gathering techniques can be manipulated by a single person or a family; the nature of techniques limits the scale of cooperation. Cooperation in gathering was usually between households in the same settlement. No more than three households cooperated in any kind of gathering activity.

5. Staple food-stuffs of the Ainu were gathered from a relatively narrow area surrounding their settlement and covering three ecological zones, i.e. the river along which they settled, its river banks and river terraces. Main hunting and fishing sites were fixed in location owing to the adaptability of their techniques to migrative habits of animals. Under these conditions, the Ainu were enabled to live in permanent settlement in spite of their dependence upon gathering life. Settlements, however, were usually small in size and were scattered along a river course in connection with the distribution of the spawning grounds of dog salman. 105 361 311

6. The Ainu maintained several categories of territories. The major category was the territory of a river group which covered the valley of a river as distinguished by the Ainu and was maintained throughout the four seasons. 105 423 619

11: Watanabe E-4,5 (1951-1959) 1964 AB6 Ainu AB6

105 423 619 The river valley constituted a unit area of resource distributions; the territory formed a nearly or completely self-contained unit of Ainu habitat. Within this were territories of minor categories which were seasonally maintained by such smaller groups as the local group, the cooperative group and the individual household. These might be hunting or fishing sites exploited by means of fixed devices or concentrations of certain specific resources which annually recurred at the same places.

105 182 7. The ecological system of the Ainu functions on adaptation of their techniques to the spatio-temporal structure of the activities of biotic species. The Ainu system of relationships in beliefs and ritual of man and nature is their own theory and practice for maintainance of the ecological system.

105 619 771 [776] [614] 8. The Ainu system of social solidarity between man and nature was established on the principle of coresidence or local contiguity within a river valley as the territory of the river group. Ainu cosmology emphasized its component of spatial orientation; nature, i.e. *kamui*, were ordered on local basis. The effective ritual relationship between those spatially oriented *kamni* and the Ainu was in the hands of the patrilineal kin group of males which was the basis of Ainu local organization.

121 Every organism leads its concrete life in a given environment; that no animal can function apart from its habitat is amply shown in animal ecology. It follows that when we look at man as a functioning organism and try to understand his group life as part of a living system, the relationship of the group with its habitat should be first examined. The present study shows that between the Ainu and their habitat there exist two systems of interrelations working on quite different levels: the first is an ecological system, i.e. a system of relationships through technological activities of man with habitat, and the second, a system of social solidarity between man and nature, i.e. a system of relationships through beliefs and rituals of man with habitat.

[114] Significance of ecological factors relevant to group structure has been worked out by STEWARD (1938), EVANS-PRITCHARD (1940) and FORDE (1947) and the importance of the relationships through native beliefs and rituals between man and nature in connection with social organization has been shown by RADCLIFFE-BROWN (1952) and FORDE (1954), while the present study on the Ainu shows the reciprocal adjustment between the ecological system and the system of social solidarity between man and habitat and the group structure.

11: Watanabe E-4,5 (1951-1959) 1964 AB6 Ainu AB6

614 denoting upper-stream people living in Sanenkoro and *kotans* above it, and lower-stream people living in Chirokto and *kontans* below it, respectively. The term to denote the people of the middle course was not kept in memory by my informant Ushino. The first at least, it seems, indicates the extreme upstream *shine itokpa* group, but nothing definite can be known.

619 (18) The presence of a territorial group based on the unit of a river valley, already suggested by NATORI (NATORI, 1940), and TAKAKURA (TAKAKURA's oral information to IZUMI in IZUMI, 1951, p. 30), has been confirmed by IZUMI on his survey of the Saru River (IZUMI, 1951). That on the Saru as elsewhere the territorial group represented a kind of corporate group might be inferred from IZUMI's account of joint actions in time of disputes with other river groups, of joint ritual observance praying against tidal waves and landslides, and of repelling trespasses of other river members on their areas. At any rate little has been made clear about the relationship between this and various smaller territorial groups. Nor has the fact been ever noticed that the inhabitants of the larger river systems such as the Tokapchi, instead of forming a single river group, constituted more than one on the basis of each "river" as distinguished in the Ainu classification.

611 (19) Concerning the *Huchi Ikiru*.

An aged Tokapchi informant says: "A *shine huchi ikiru*, when three generations back, goes out of memory and little can be known about it".

A certain female informant was able to name 35 women of her *shine huchi ikiru* within a depth of six generations (SUGIURA, 1951, p. 209). Another woman is said to have as many as 20 living female relatives of her *huchi ikiru* (SEGAWA, 1951, p. 251).

611 292 [831] It is assumed by SUGIURA that a *huchi ikiru* group was symbolized by one and the same form of the *upshoru kut*, chastity belt (SUGIURA, 1951, pp. 3 and 21). Doubt may be raised, however, as to whether so many different forms existed; in fact, the possibility is that some same forms, like some family names, might have found wide distribution beyond the sphere of a single kin group, in the present case, a *huchi ikiru* group.

Inherent difficulty has impeded any satisfactory investigation on the various forms of the *upshoru kut* and their relation with the *huchi ikiru*. SEGAWA, in her studies on Ainu beliefs about it and related Ainu ideas and attitudes, states as follows.

It is affirmed by every Ainu that there was slight difference in the braiding of cords attached to the *upshoru kut* or in their number according to different *shine huchi ikiru*. But it is unthinkable that so great a variety of forms as generally suggested could have existed. Some information has been

11: Watanabe E-4,5 (1951-1959) 1964 AB6 Ainu AB6

(45) Evidence for non-coincidence between the river group territory and the valley of the river. 133 423 619 823

Tokapchi.—Geographically, the river Sorapchi is a tributary of the river Ishikari and its valley a part of the valley of the Ishikari river system. Practically, however, the part of the Sorapchi river basin that lies above the line of the Nishitap glen that feeds it and the Numoppe glen that feeds the Nishitap, formed a portion of the Tokapchi river group's territory (Map 2). This means that Tokapchi territory extended in part over the intervening watershed into the Ishikari river basin. In this extension of territory the Tokapchi Ainu from at least the Kuttaraushi and Nitmap local groups maintained hunters' huts, to which they came for bear hunts every season (p. 59). The area was also visited by collectors from Tokapchi who gathered bark for making textile material. For the fact of its belonging to the Tokapchi river group Ushino from Nitmap accounts: "The upper Sorapchi runs parallel with the Sahorun that feeds the Tokapchi and points with it in the direction of Mt. Optateshuke, the 'head' mountain of the river Tokapchi. That is why the upper Sorapchi belonged to Tokapchi". A similar reason is seen applied to the following other cases. The valley of the Shikaripet, tributary to the Tokapchi and inhabited by some of the member local groups of the upper Tokapchi *shine itokpa* group, belonged for the most part to the Tokapchi, or *shipet*, river group. But part of its lower region, that part of it on the Otopuke side which is bordered by the river's lower course from the mouth to the junction with the tributary Penkechin glen and then by the course of this glen, was included in the Otopuke river group territory (Map 2). The point was confirmed by my two informants, Ushino from Tokapchi and Kazari from Otopuke. Ushino explains that 'inasmuch as the Shikaripet flows out of one mountain with the Tokapchi, it belonged truly to Tokapchi.' Kazari on the other hand explains that the glens of the Shikaripet on its west side belonged to Tokapchi because they all point to the depth of Tokapchi, whereas those on its north side belonged to Otopuke because they point to Otopuke.

Otopuke.—The terriotry[1] of the Otopuke river group stretched out again in part in its interior region into the geographical basin of the neighbouring Tushipet, extending the whole breadth between the Meto and Nukanan glens down to the Piripet tributary into which they flow, the three streams forming the boundaries on the Tushipet river group territory (Map 2). Of the

[1] [Errata: the word "terriotry" should read "territory"—Analyst]

11: Watanabe E-4,5 (1951-1959) 1964 AB6 Ainu AB6

territory of the Otopuke river group, that part of it which extended over the watershed into the Tsushipet river basin was called *ekoipokun an (Otopuke) iworu* (*iworu* in the east of Otopuke), while the aforesaid portion that bordered on Shikaripet was called *echupokun an (Otopuke) iworu* (*iworu* in the west of Otopuke); the geographical Otopuke river basin plus the above portions was known as Otopuke *iworu*. The reason given by Kazari for the two glens forming the territorial boundaries is that they run on the west side of Mt. Piripet where all the glens point in the direction, and flow out, of 'the true head mountain of the Otopuke' that lies deep in the most revered source of the main Otopuke. The glens rest on Otopuke and that is why their areas formed its *iworu*. On the other hand, the glens on the east side of the mountain point to the head of the Tushipet: they rest on Tushipet. That is why their areas formed the *iworu* thereof.

Tushipet.—Mention has already been made of the Tushipet river basin, home of the Tsuhipet river group, forming in part an extension of the neighbouring Otopuke river group area; into another part of the same basin there extended the Kusuri river group's territory adjoining on the other side. This was an area encircled on one side by the watershed draining on the Penkesempiri side into the Ashoro, tributary to the Tushipet, on another side by the main course of the Tushipet above the end of the watershed and on another by the watershed that divides the Tushipet and Kusuri river basins.

Mukawa.—As Kashindeashi of Chin heard from people of the older generation who lived the traditional life, their hill hunting grounds for deer lay at the head of the Noyasube glen that feeds the neighbouring river Azuma. They were covered with a well-developed fir forest, affording fine winter quarters for the deer, and the hunters built their huts on the edge of the forest. Geographically, the place lies within the Azuma river valley, but it never belonged to Azuma *iworu* or basin as distinguished by the Ainu. Though the actual demarcation lines are not clear, the lower Noyasube which is tributary to the Azuma belonged, at any rate by Ainu distinction, to Azuma *iworu* and therefore to the Azuma Ainu. Nevertheless, the uppermost reaches of the glen alone belonged to the Mukawa Ainu. The reason, though vague, is given as below. Three glens flow out of the waterhead mountain—the Noyasube, the Irushikapet and the Moipet. Of these only the Noyasube flows on the side of Azuma; the other glens, running on the side of Mukawa, enter Mukawa *iworu* or basin. That is why the uppermost Noyasube, rising as it does with the others in the same mountain, belonged alone to Mukawa *iworu*.

Saru.—As Hachiro Kurokawa, son of the Nukipet headman's brother, heard from people of the older generation, the natives of the Nukapira, tributary

1, [Errata: the word "at" should read "as". Cf. errata sheet, p.164-A--Analyst]

11: Watanabe E-4,5 (1951-1959) 1964 AB6 Ainu AB6

to the Saru, went for bear hunts beyond the upper reaches of their river into those of the adjacent Nikap river. For the area on the Nukapira side that stretched between the Puirapet and Aipet glens, both tributary to the upper Nikap, was Nukapira terriotory, whereas the area lying opposite was Nikap territory and no Nukapira Ainu could cross the river Nikap without permission. This area on the upper Nikap which formed an extension of Nukapira territory apparently coincides with what has already been reported by IZUMI as a part of Saru iworu (IZUMI, 1951, p. 43). He ascribes the origin to a strife in which the area was taken by the people of Saru as prize from those of a neighbouring river area. As far as the author has examined, no information is available from any river valley to confirm such an origin.

These briefly are the evidences from which it might very roughly be concluded that there is no doubt about the Ainu conceptions of territory resting upon their cosmological theory on the relations between the river and the mountain and the actual demarcation being conditioned by that theory. The details will be given in Charpter VI.

(46) It may be assumed from what Hachiro Kurokawa of Nukipet, an old Ainu settlement on the Nukapira, tributary to the river Saru, a son of a brother of the Nukipet headman, heard from people of the elder generation who knew traditional life, that the natives living on the Nukapira river course—residents of Nukipet (a local group), Nioi and Shikerepe (both probably local groups) settlements—had been from old times a group by themselves distinct from any others living along the main Saru, or a distinct 'river group' as termed by the writer. By native distinction the river Nukapira, like the river Saru, formed a distinct *pet*, main stream or river, pointing to its own head mountain, Poroshiri. The two rivers were accompanied each by a river-spirit, *petorun kamui* of its own. The people of Saru observed their own ritual for the Saru river-spirit, *petorun kamuinomi*; those of Nukapira their own. On some necessary occasions the inhabitants of Nukapira conducted a group activity independent of the Saru people. "Members of the same river group could freely go gathering anywhere within their own river area, as did the Nukapira people. But the people of Nukapira were not to go fishing without permission in the Saru river area. In any area other than their own they could never act freely". This information, of which little more particulars are to be known, carries an impression that the people of Nukapira might have formed a different river group from those of Saru. IZUMI's report on the Saru Ainu as a territorial group gives no mention about these point[1] but treats the natives of the Nukapira and the main Saru as belonging to the same river group. Apart from this, there is no available report relating to the matter.

1, [Errata: the word "point" should read "points". Cf. errata sheet, p. 164-A--Analyst]